

**Approved**

**STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH  
DISABILITIES**

**June 2, 2006**

**Indiana Department of Education  
Indianapolis, IN**

**ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Stephanie Beasley, Dawn Downer, Christina Endres, Karol Farrell, David Geeslin, James Hammond, Cathleen Hardy Hansen, Bessie Henson, Becky Kirk, John Nally, Kathy Mears, David Schmidt, Lilia Teninty for Pete Bisbecos, Steve Tilden, Julie Swaim, Jane Swiss

**ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:**

Bret Lewis Gary Bates Marcia Johnson, Mary Ramos; Rose Black, Cynthia Diamond, Martha Farris, Sarah Renner, Cheryl Shearer

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (DEL) STAFF PRESENT:**

Bob Marra, Paul Ash, Nina Brahm, Becky Reynolds, Nicole Confer (Summer Intern for afternoon session)

**GUESTS:**

Sharon Knoth; Richard Burden, IN\*SOURCE; Joni Schmalzried, Director of Special Education for Wabash-Miami Area Programs; Sally Hamburg, IN\*SOURCE; Rebecca Kirby, IPIN; Mike Hedden, DORS

**VISITORS**

Susan Lockwood, IDOC; Loui Lord Nelson, R.A.I.S.E., Inc.; Kathy Lee, ICRC; Christine CdeBaca, ICRC

**INTERPRETERS:**

Dave Calvert, Randy Nicolai

## **MEETING**

David Schmidt called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. State Advisory Council (SAC) members introduced themselves.

## **MINUTES**

The minutes from the meeting on April 7, 2006, were approved as a correct document.

## **OSEP PREPARATION FOR VIDEO CONFERENCE CALL**

B. Marra explained the logistics of the OSEP conference call. Federal officials will be in Indianapolis the week of August 14, 2006 to monitor the IDOE. OSEP stressed that they wanted to interview people, groups and parents who had interests in children with disabilities. It was decided that the State Advisory Council was the best representative. OSEP would like to verify data reported to them. B. Marra informed SAC that OSEP wants to determine what state systems are effective in assuring compliance including performance. Bob requested that council members be honest when answering questions by OSEP during the conference call. Bob stated that the report for the monitoring visit will be distributed in December. Rich Burden from IN\*SOURCE and Rebecca Kirby from IPIN were asked to attend on behalf of parent groups. P & A was invited but did not attend. B. Marra commented that we are one of three states that have yet to be monitored. B. Marra feels that this is reason to believe that we are running a good system. The OSEP conference call took place at 1:00 p.m. OSEP informed SAC that the monitoring report would be given to IDOE in December.

## **HOUSEKEEPING**

B. Reynolds reminded SAC that flash drives were available to anyone who needed them.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

No other business at this time.

## **Meeting**

Next meeting will be on Friday August 4, 2006 at Carmel Clay Educational Service Center.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT (Audience comments, if any)**

Visitors had no comments.

## **PRE-DISCUSSION FOR ARTICLE 7 REVISIONS TO 511 IAC 7 ~~17-32-75~~. TRANSITION SERVICES**

B. Marra instructed the SAC to think about retaining the age of transition at age 14 rather than 16 years of age. B. Marra would like the SAC to think of what is in the best interest of the children. B. Marra introduced Nancy Zemaitis, Brett Bollinger, Sally Hamburg and Joni Schmalzried, who are part of the IN-SIG grant committee which is a collaborative group working with standards based education and Core 40

B. Bollinger, the co-director of the IN-SIG grant, presented an overview of the IN-SIG committee's purpose. B. Bollinger explained that IN-SIG has been working with ICAN to develop a process to effectively monitor and document individual student progress called Indiana Skills and Employment Reporting Initiative.

B. Bollinger stated that a statute requiring a Summary of Performance (SoP) goes into effect July 1, 2006. The SoP provides a student with a summary of the student's academic achievement and functional performance and includes recommendations on how to assist the student in meeting post-secondary goals. IDEIA does not require a SoP for students who leave school early or graduate with a certificate of completion. The committee recommends that Indiana go beyond the Federal requirement and ensure that all students with disabilities be required to have a SoP, as it is believed that students will benefit from comprehensive SoP. IDEIA does not require the transition planning to commence until age 16. However, the committee also believes that Indiana should go beyond the Federal requirements and keep transition planning at age 14.

J. Schmalzried, Director of Special Education for Wabash-Miami Area Programs, presented with regard to her cooperative's accomplishments in the area of transition and the SoP. J. Schmalzried indicated that the SoP aids the student in being able to adequately tell others what supplemental services or supports they need to succeed in the job or post-secondary situation. Students need to be able to self-advocate and articulate their specific need. The SoP will help them to do so.

J. Schmalzried stated that a graduate follow-up survey for 2004-2005 school year found that 85% of diploma students, 48% of students who left with a certificate of completion and 55% of students who drop out of school, were engaged in gainful employment

K. Farrell asked if there were a minimum number of hours they needed to work in order to be considered gainfully employed. B. Marra concurred that there are no minimum number of hours and that all of the data needs to be cautiously interpreted as it is self-reporting by each student.

B. Kirk indicated that it is not just finding a job for the student, but rather finding the right job to match the strengths and unique needs of the student. J. Schmalzried agreed and stated that she believes the SoP will aid in ensuring the match or fit is found.

J. Swiss asked whether there were data that looked specifically at students who pursued post-secondary training. J. Schmalzried indicated that there is data in the National Longitudinal Study and the Graduate Follow-Up Study but she did not bring that data with her. D. Schmidt and B. Henson concurred with the positive potential that the SoP could provide for students.

J. Hammond asked several questions pertaining to students with disabilities and what type of strategies or skills were found to aid in their success.

1) Did you track any of the success factors of students who are in special education, but also were enrolled in vocational education? 2) were there any reasons for success or lack of success in that area? 3) Working with those students with significant disabilities you may have either had access to vocational/rehabilitation service earlier than typical or maybe those who are enrolled in support services waiver, did they have any better chance of success than those who didn't have access to those services? In individual education plans were there any goals or things that were remarkable that helped increase the productivity with people with a significant disability would help indicate better success on jobs? J. Schmalzried responded that one of the things found is that the more information collected the more they realize they need. There is some good data on vocational education in special education. Approximately 85% of kids with disabilities participate some kind of vocational education program that increased only a certain percentage and that was in a national study and they are factoring some of this out.

B. Marra indicated that they were very good questions that the SAC needs to look at for future discussions on transition. J. Schmalzried indicated that her dissertation thesis is actually looking at what skills or specific components of a transition plan aided or helped facilitate success for students with disabilities.

J. Swaim brought up the concept of self-advocacy and the need to ensure that it is in place prior to the beginning of high school. J. Schmalzried indicated that she sees the SoP aiding in that as well. J. Schmalzried added that the SoP should be a continuation of what the student has been working on; a component ensuring the student is able to self-advocate and articulate their strengths and self-determination to others.

S. Tilden asked how the SoP would work with those students in Charter Schools, DOC schools, and Juvenile Justice. The details for the tough-to-reach students have not yet been worked out. J. Schmalzried indicated that they have a correctional facility in her district that they are working on SoPs and these students will be transitioning back to their home communities. This again is an

area where we really need to go beyond Federal regulations as this is a huge area of need for our students.

C. Hardy-Hansen asked how self-advocacy skills were taught; is there a curriculum for this? J. Schmaltzreid said there is no one curriculum or a canned set of skills that fit every student but the committee is looking at what the common components of those being used throughout the state and how to assess a student on those core items. N. Zemitis indicated that this is why using ICAN is such a nice fit as it does allow the teacher to add or link curricular components to each student's plan and then also link those items to the state academic standards. Once done, teachers throughout the state can access those templates that work well instead of having to continuously reinvent the wheel.

S. Hamburg addressed the SAC with regard to the parental perspective from the transition committee. There truly is a huge commitment from everyone on the committee to ensure that the SoP looks at how the family can assist the student in meeting success. Keeping the age of transition at age 14 coincides with existing initiatives and mandates such as the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars program, the ISTAR employability skills standards, the State standards that begin career exploration at 1<sup>st</sup> grade and other State initiatives that look at giving all of our students the skills they need to fit in a global economy. When you look at the core skills that students need to have mastered prior to exiting schools, how can you possibly start at age 16 to begin teaching them? B. Kirk discussed how hard it is for families to transition. B. Kirk stated that it is important that schools work with parents to make sure that a smooth transition takes place for the family as a whole and the student specifically – especially that last big transition. Parents need time to adjust and that in itself makes it more important to start at age 14 and not 16.

## **ARTICLE 7 REVISIONS**

Review of 511 IAC 7 ~~17-32-75~~  
Transition Services

Nina Brahm led discussion with regard to Transition Services language.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT (Audience comments, if any)**

No additional public comment.

## **OSEP CONFERENCE CALL**

Angela McCaskell opened the conference call at approximately 1:05 p.m. A. McCaskel introduced Larry Ringer, Associate Division Director for Monitoring and State Improvement Planning and Lynne Fairfax, State Consultant

SAC introduced themselves and their role on the council.

L. Teninty, R. Burden and R. Kirby, (guests of SAC for the OSEP conference call) introduced themselves.

OSEP provided over-arching questions that were divided into three sections: 1) General Supervision; 2) Statewide and District-wide Assessment (Part B only); 3) Collection and reporting of data under section 618 of the IDEA.

After a brief question/answer session, A. McCaskell thanked everyone for their comments. A. McCaskell informed SAC that if there were any additional thoughts or comments that they may contact her.

Bob Marra thanked everyone for attending.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm.**